

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are all the claims currently pending in the application. In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

I. Overview of the Office Action

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-15 and 17-19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Chia-Chiang Ho et al, “Towards User Oriented Scalable Video by Using Foveated FGS Bitstreams”, IEEE Communications and Multimedia Lab, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan, pages 46-47, June 2003, (hereafter “Ho”).

Claims 4-6, 10-12, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chia-Chiang and further in view of Geisler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,252,989, hereafter “Geisler”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

II. Claim rejections

The Examiner asserts that Ho allegedly teaches all of the features of independent claim 1 and analogous independent claims 7, 13, 17, 21, and 22. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Ho that “decoding of the enhancement layer bitstream of areas of the video object other than the area-of-interest is not performed, and decoding of the base layer bitstream of areas of the video object other than the area-of-interest is performed”, as recited in claim 1 and analogously recited in independent claims 7, 13, 17, 21, and 22.

Ho merely teaches that foveation is used to provide user oriented scalability. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Ho does not teach or suggest “decoding of the enhancement layer bitstream of areas of the video object other than the area-of-interest is not performed, and decoding of the base layer bitstream of areas of the video object other than the area-of-interest is performed”, as claimed.

Further, Geisler does not make up for the above-noted deficiencies of Ho.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 7, 13, 17, 21, and 22 should be allowable because the cited reference does not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims. Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-16 and 18-20 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 17.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark E. Wallerson/

Mark E. Wallerson
Registration No. 59,043

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 30, 2010